

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-14, 16-18, 20-23, 25-28, 30-31 and 33-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balogh (Pub. No.: US. 2001/0024953) in view of Russell (Pub. No.: US. 2004/0249915) (*both references were cited in the previous Office Action*) and Campen (Pub. No.: US 2004/0198335).

Regarding claim 1, Balogh teaches a method comprising:

a) storing in the mobile telephone a plurality of different sets of parameter settings, each of which is associated with a location (see paragraphs [0024] and [0029]);

b) detecting at the mobile telephone the current location of the mobile telephone (paragraph [0031]); and

c) controlling the mobile telephone using the set of parameter settings associated with the detected current location (paragraph [0033]).

It should be noticed that Balogh fails to clearly teach the features of downloading a set of parameter settings to the mobile telephone when the mobile telephone enters a new location.

However, Russell teaches such features in paragraphs [0085] and [0117] for a purpose of attempting to communicate with new contracted networks.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the features of downloading a set of parameter settings to the mobile telephone when the mobile telephone enters a new location, as taught by Russell, into view of Balogh in order to update the database of the mobile phone as well as to establish communications to available new networks.

It should be further noticed that Balogh and Russell, in combination, fails to clearly teach the features of *wherein at least one parameter setting is a user specified protected parameter setting that is not allowed to be changed during performance of a parameter setting update process*, as argued and amended by the Applicants. However, Campen teaches a remote controllable wireless device which an administrator specified an authentication identifier, as a user specified protected parameter that prevents unauthorized control parameters from being changed in wireless devices 120-140 (see paragraphs [0014] and [0018]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the features of wherein at least one parameter setting is a user specified protected parameter setting that is not allowed to be changed during performance of a parameter setting update process, as taught by Campen, into view of Balogh and Russell in order to prevent accidentally or unauthorized changes to the control parameters of the mobile phone.

Regarding claims 2-3, Balogh further teaches limitations of the claims in paragraphs [0036]-[0038].

Regarding claim 4, Balogh further teaches limitations of the claims in paragraphs [0028] and [0034].

Regarding claim 6, Russell further teaches the “User Personality Profile” as provisioning document in paragraph [0080].

Regarding claim 7-8, Balogh further teaches limitations of the claims in paragraphs [0025]-[0026] and [0031]-[0032].

Regarding claim 10, Balogh further teaches limitations of the claim in paragraph [0033].

Regarding claim 11, Balogh teaches an apparatus comprising:

a memory for storing a plurality of different sets of parameter settings and a database for associating each set of parameter settings with a location (see paragraphs [0024], [0029] and [0049]);

a detector for detecting the current location of the apparatus (paragraph [0031]); and

a controller for interrogating the database to obtain the set of parameter settings associated with the current location and for controlling the apparatus in dependence upon the obtained set of parameter settings (paragraph [0033]).

It should be noticed that Balogh fails to clearly teach the features of an interface for downloading a set of parameter settings when the apparatus enters a new location. However, Russell teaches such features in paragraphs [0085] and [0117] for a purpose of attempting to communicate with new contracted networks.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the features of downloading a set of parameter settings when the apparatus enters a new location, as taught by Russell, into view of Balogh in

order to update the database of the mobile phone as well as to establish communications to available new networks.

It should be further noticed that Balogh and Russell, in combination, fails to clearly teach the features of *wherein at least one parameter setting is a user specified protected parameter setting that is not allowed to be changed during performance of a parameter setting update process*, as argued and amended by the Applicants. However, Campen teaches a remote controllable wireless device which an administrator specified an authentication identifier, as a user specified protected parameter, which prevents unauthorized control parameters from being changed in wireless devices 120-140 (see paragraphs [0014] and [0018]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the features of wherein at least one parameter setting is a user specified protected parameter setting that is not allowed to be changed during performance of a parameter setting update process, as taught by Campen, into view of Balogh and Russell in order to prevent accidentally or unauthorized changes to the control parameters of the mobile phone.

Regarding claims 12-13, Balogh further teaches limitations of the claims in paragraphs [0036]-[0038].

Regarding claim 14, Balogh further teaches limitations of the claim in paragraphs [0028] and [0034].

Regarding claim 16, Russell further teaches the “User Personality Profile” as provisioning document in paragraph [0080].

Regarding claims 17-18, note paragraphs [0025]-[0026] and [0031]-[0032].

Regarding claim 20, Balogh further teaches limitations of the claim in paragraph [0033].

Regarding claim 21, Balogh teaches an apparatus comprising:

mean for storing in the mobile telephone a plurality of different sets of parameter settings, each of which is associated with a location (see paragraphs [0024] and [0029]);

means for detecting the current location of the apparatus (paragraph [0031]); and

means for interrogating the database to obtaining the set of parameter settings associated with the current location and for controlling the apparatus in dependence upon the obtained set of parameter settings (paragraph [0033]).

It should be noticed that Balogh fails to clearly teach the features of downloading a set of parameter settings to the apparatus when the apparatus enters a new location. However, Russell teaches such features in paragraphs [0085] and [0117] for a purpose of attempting to communicate with new contracted networks.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the features of downloading a set of parameter settings to the apparatus when the apparatus enters a new location, as taught by Russell, into view of Balogh in order to update the database of the mobile phone as well as to establish communications to available new networks.

It should be further noticed that Balogh and Russell, in combination, fails to clearly teach the features of ***wherein at least one parameter setting is a user specified protected parameter setting that is not allowed to be changed during performance of a parameter setting update process***, as argued and amended by the Applicants. However, Campen teaches a remote controllable wireless device which an administrator specified an authentication identifier, as a

user specified protected parameter, which prevents unauthorized control parameters from being changed in wireless devices 120-140 (see paragraphs [0014] and [0018]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the features of wherein at least one parameter setting is a user specified protected parameter setting that is not allowed to be changed during performance of a parameter setting update process, as taught by Campen, into view of Balogh and Russell in order to prevent accidentally or unauthorized changes to the control parameters of the mobile phone.

Regarding claim 22, Balogh further teaches limitations of the claim in paragraphs [0036]-[0038].

Regarding claim 23, Balogh further teaches limitations of the claims in paragraphs [0025]-[0026] and [0031]-[0032].

Regarding claim 25, Balogh further teaches limitations of the claim in paragraph [0033].

Regarding claim 26, Balogh teaches a computer readable medium encoded with a computer program comprising:

a) computer code for storing in the mobile communication device a plurality of different sets of parameter settings, each of which is associated with a location (see paragraphs [0024] and [0029]);

b) computer code for detecting at the mobile communication device the current location of the mobile communication device (paragraph [0031]); and

c) computer code for controlling the mobile communication device using the set of parameter settings associated with the detected current location (paragraph [0033]).

It should be noticed that Balogh fails to clearly teach the features of downloading a set of parameter settings to the mobile communication device when the mobile communication device enters a new location. However, Russell teaches such features in paragraphs [0085] and [0117] for a purpose of attempting to communicate with new contracted networks.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the features of downloading a set of parameter settings to the mobile communication device when the mobile communication device enters a new location, as taught by Russell, into view of Balogh in order to update the database of the mobile phone as well as to establish communications to available new networks.

It should be further noticed that Balogh and Russell, in combination, fails to clearly teach the features of *wherein at least one parameter setting is a user specified protected parameter setting that is not allowed to be changed during performance of a parameter setting update process*, as argued and amended by the Applicants. However, Campen teaches a remote controllable wireless device which an administrator specified an authentication identifier, as a user specified protected parameter, which prevents unauthorized control parameters from being changed in wireless devices 120-140 (see paragraphs [0014] and [0018]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the features of wherein at least one parameter setting is a user specified protected parameter setting that is not allowed to be changed during performance of a parameter setting update process, as taught by Campen, into view of Balogh and Russell in order to prevent accidentally or unauthorized changes to the control parameters of the mobile phone.

Regarding claim 27, Balogh further teaches limitations of the claims in paragraphs [0036]-[0038].

Regarding claim 28, Balogh further teaches limitations of the claims in paragraphs [0028] and [0034].

Regarding claim 30, Russell further teaches the “User Personality Profile” as provisioning document in paragraph [0080].

Regarding claim 31, Balogh further teaches limitations of the claims in paragraphs [0025]-[0026] and [0031]-[0032].

Regarding claim 34, Russell teaches in paragraph [0089] that the device tries to register and authenticate with a new contracted network. It loads and loopbacks each of the set of parameter settings related to contracted networks in order to establish communication with a new contracted network. Upon attempts, each set of parameter settings of the contracted networks was not changed or altered. Thus, each set of parameter settings was protected from irrespective of location.

Regarding claim 35, Russell further teaches limitations of the claim in paragraphs [0096] and [0098].

Regarding new claims 36-39, Campen further teaches the features in paragraph [0014]. Campen teaches that the registration of the wireless device 120-140 may include providing model and device specific information. The model and device information may include an identifier for email and an IP address which is settings for an internet browser.

3. Claims 5, 15 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balogh (Pub. No.: US. 2001/0024953) in view of Russell (Pub. No.: US. 2004/0249915) and Campen (Pub. No.: US 2004/0198335) as applied to claims 1, 11 and 26 above, and further in view of Daigle et al. (Pub. No.: US 2004/0054719, also cited in the previous Office Action).

Regarding claims 5, 15 and 29, Balogh, Russell and Campen, in combination, fails to clearly teach the features of the application settings include settings for an email client. However, Daigle et al. ("Daigle") teaches such features in paragraph [0082] for a purpose of transceiving instant messages (IMs) to and from a remote IM client.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the features of the application settings include settings for an email client, as taught by Daigle, into view of Balogh, Russell and Campen in order to receive emails and the like.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8, 10-18, 20-23, 25-31 and 33-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for response to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the date of this action. In the event a first response is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event will the statutory period for response expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

Application/Control Number: **Error! Unknown document property name.**
Art Unit: **Error! Unknown document property name.**

Page 11

Box AF
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231
Or faxed to:
(703) 872-9314 or (571) 273-8300 (for formal communications; please
“EXPEDITED PROCEDURE”)
Or:
If it is an informal or draft communication, please label
“PROPOSED” or “DRAFT”)
Hand Carry Deliveries to:
Customer Service Window
(Randolph Building)
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Binh K. Tieu whose telephone number is (571) 272-7510 and E-mail address: BINH.TIEU@USPTO.GOV.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Curtis Kuntz, can be reached on (571) 272-7499 and **IF PAPER HAS BEEN MISSED FROM THIS OFFICIAL ACTION PACKAGE, PLEASE CALL CUSTOMER SERVICE FOR THE SUBSTITUTIONS OR COPIES.**

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the FAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/BINH K. TIEU/
Primary Examiner
Technology Division 2614

Date: October, 2008